

8-27-1957

Ambassadorial Appointments

Mike Mansfield 1903-2001

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches

Recommended Citation

Mansfield, Mike 1903-2001, "Ambassadorial Appointments" (1957). *Mike Mansfield Speeches*. 247.
https://scholarworks.umt.edu/mansfield_speeches/247

This Speech is brought to you for free and open access by the Mike Mansfield Papers at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Mike Mansfield Speeches by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

FOR RELEASE
TUE AUG 27 1957 AM

AMBASSADORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. President:

I wonder whether there is anyone in this country who can read who does not know the name of Maxwell Gluck. I wonder how many newspaper columnists have been provided with a free subject during the last month. I wonder how many recent jokes have used the name of Mr. Gluck.

Mr. President, I feel sorry for Mr. Gluck. He did nothing different from a large number of ambassadors who have been appointed under this Administration and previous Administrations both Republican and Democratic.

The fact is, however, Mr. President, that the trial of Mr. Gluck has placed the spotlight of healthy publicity on several long-standing problems in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States and has made available to the public considerable new information.

I think a great many people now appreciate for the first time how important it is that we have good ambassadors to represent us overseas. I think that the proper policy on this subject is now pretty well agreed. The right policy is well stated in the words of the letter which was sent by the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Green, to the Secretary of State on April 3, 1957, on the subject of ambassadors: "It should be obvious in each case,

whether the nominee is a career man or not, that his record, his intelligence, his background, and his attitude are such that he will ably serve our country in his assignment."

The controversy over Mr. Gluck has, I think, dramatized another fact -- the fact that Presidents of the United States, both Republican and Democratic, in recent years have not been wholly to blame for some of the bad appointments which we have had. Republican and Democratic National Committees have not been wholly to blame either. The sad truth is, Mr. President, that the Congress must share the blame for this unhappy situation. The fact is that if the Department of State had available to it adequate funds to pay the necessary cost of running our embassies abroad and doing the official entertaining which is unavoidable we could fill every ambassadorial post with an able man whether he happened to be a career Foreign Service Officer or a non-career appointee. If the representation allowances were sufficient it would be possible to make appointments of ambassadors strictly on the basis of merit and qualifications. I would like to say, incidentally, that I am not one of those who believes that we should never appoint a non-career ambassador. Career people are usually very able but there are also men and women -- such as David Bruce, ^{BUNKER} Clare Booth Luce, Ellsworth ~~Burke~~, Douglas Dillon, and others -- of outstanding qualifications outside the career service. It is a very good thing for the career service to have brought in from time to time individuals of high ability who have had careers in business or science or education or labor which qualify them to represent the United States abroad quite as fully as a lifetime in the Foreign Service.

I have said that the Congress must take a large share of the responsibility for poor ambassadors. The Committee on Foreign Relations must take a major part of the blame for having let some poor nominations become confirmed. But, Mr. President, we would not have had many of these poor nominations come before us if there were not the underlying problem of inadequate representation allowances for the Department of State. Those on the inside of Congress, so to speak, know where the fault lies here. The blame can be laid squarely at the door of the House Committee on Appropriations. Year after year the Department of State in presenting its request for appropriations asks for an adequate amount for representation allowances. Every year the House Committee slashes the request. This year the Department asked for \$1,200,000 for representation allowances. The House Committee cut the request to \$600,000. Every year the Senate Appropriations Committee does its best to restore some of the cut made by the House, but in the process of compromise the Senate cannot fully succeed in obtaining an adequate appropriation. I strongly regret this unhappy history, Mr. President, and I hope the recent education on the subject which we have had will make it possible to do something more constructive next year.

Mr. President, one of the other interesting facts which has come out as a result of Mr. Gluck's appointment has been the revelation that the most sought after ambassadorial posts are not being given to career diplomats, but to political appointees. London, Paris, Rome, Bonn, Brussels, The Hague, Stockholm, Madrid, Copenhagen, Dublin, New Delhi, and the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization in Paris -- all these important posts, Mr. President, are now filled by non-career appointments. Some of these non-career people are indeed excellent people but the fact that a career person has not been appointed is almost invariably related to a question of money. These desirable posts are located in countries of the highest importance to the United States. We ought to have our very best people there. Because these countries are important, however, there is a great deal of official business to transact. We must have large embassies and there is much official and necessary entertaining to be done. Ambassadors without some outside income -- and even second or third ranking people in these embassies without some outside income -- simply cannot, under present circumstances, remain in these posts. The question again is whether the United States, the richest country in the world, is willing to pay what it costs to get the best men available in these jobs.

Mr. President, I wish to mention another cause of poor ambassadorial appointments which is not always related to the question of money. It is generally known that Presidents and Secretaries of State of whatever political party have in the past been under pressure from those who feel that an ambassadorship is a reward for past service to a political party. One of the purposes of sending from the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Department of State the letter, to which I referred a moment ago, was to try to take some of this pressure off the President and the Secretary of State. Far be it from me to discourage financial contributions to political parties, but I think that any President, if he has a mind to do it, can see to it that a financial contribution or

a non-financial contribution to a political party is not of itself sufficient to obtain for a man a nomination to be ambassador. Frankly, I am of the opinion that President Eisenhower was either uninformed or just plain naive in disclaiming any knowledge of a connection between campaign contributions and ambassadorial appointments. This is silly. Of course he knows -- or ought to know -- about the connection and he can do something about it. We need more money for representation allowances, but even if representation allowances stay the same, the President of the United States has power to insure that those rich men whom he nominates are also men with outstanding qualifications to be ambassadors.

Mr. President, the travail of Ambassador Gluck has also focused attention on the problem of absences from duty of our ambassadors. It took me several months this year to get from the Department of State figures on absences from posts. I became interested in this matter because a former Ambassador to Luxembourg spent 264 days away from his post over a period of two years, for reasons which had nothing to do with foreign relations or illness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the record at this point in my remarks a letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the subject of absences of chiefs of mission from their posts of duty and two tables showing the absence figures for each of our chiefs of mission during the calendar years 1955 and 1956.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 6, 1957.

HON. THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: In the course of Governor Herter's testimony last week before your committee, Senator Mansfield requested that the Department supply information regarding absences of chiefs of mission from their post of duty during a period of approximately the past 10 years. The reference to the testimony appears at pages 72 to 74 of the hearing transcript.

Senator Mansfield recalled correctly that he had asked the Department for somewhat comparable information over a period of the last 5 years. Information was supplied to him on February 4, 1957, and subsequently on February 25 to your office in response to a similar inquiry from Mr. Holt of the committee staff. The Department's records were not adequate and a very detailed investigation was required including checks with the posts in the field. In the course of this investigation, it was determined that the longest period for which this information could be obtained with any certainty of accuracy was 2 years.

I can appreciate fully the reason for Senator Mansfield's request having encompassed a 10-year period, but I regret that the Department's records will not readily provide the information. I am supplying, therefore, as an enclosure copies of the information covering calendar years 1955 and 1956 in the hope that it will be of assistance to the committee and in the personal belief that if data were available for the 10-year period it would prove generally comparable. Following Senator Mansfield's original request the Department instituted procedures whereby this type of information would be available for any period beginning January 1, 1955.

Sincerely yours,

LOY W. HENDERSON,
Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

* * * *

Absences from posts of duty of noncareer chiefs of mission during calendar years 1955 and 1956

Name	Title and country	Period of assignment	Absences (calendar days)						1955 and 1956 total absences, calendar days	
			1955			1956			Duty	Non-duty
			Duty	Vaca- tion	Sick- ness	Duty	Vaca- tion	Sick- ness		
Arthur A. Ageton	Ambassador to Paraguay	July 28, 1954, to present	52	16	0	25	97	39	77	143
Frederick H. Alger	Ambassador to Belgium	May 20, 1953, to present	31	49	0	14	54½	3	45	106½
Winthrop W. Aldrich	Ambassador to Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Feb. 2, 1953, to present	16	96	0	29	73	0	45	169
Norman Armour	Ambassador to Guatemala	Sept. 15, 1954, to May 9, 1955	0	0	0				0	0
Wiley Thomas Buchanan, Jr.	Ambassador to Luxembourg	Sept. 2, 1953, to present	0	126	0	17	138	0	17	264
Robert D. Coe	Ambassador to Denmark	July 29, 1953, to present	10	93	0	23	77	25	33	195
James B. Conant	Ambassador to Germany	Feb. 7, 1953, to present	31	51	0	21	100	0	52	151
John Sherman Cooper	Ambassador to India	Apr. 4, 1955, to Apr. 23, 1956	0	0	0	169	1	0	169	1
Philip K. Crowe	Ambassador to Ceylon	July 9, 1953, to present	5	111	0	62	71	0	67	182
Roy Taseo Davis	Ambassador to Haiti	July 6, 1953, to present	0	64	12	12	58	34	12	168
C. Douglas Dillon	Ambassador to France	Feb. 27, 1953, to present	13	53	64	56	38	0	69	155
Homer Ferguson	Ambassador to Republic of the Philippines	Apr. 7, 1953, to Mar. 23, 1956	10	0	0	18	0	0	28	0
Arthur Gardner	Ambassador to Cuba	May 28, 1953, to present	9	13	125	31	74	0	40	212
Robert C. Hendrickson	Ambassador to New Zealand	Feb. 10, 1955, to present	44	0	0	13	44	0	57	44
Horace A. Hildreth	Ambassador to Pakistan	May 13, 1953, to present	17	75	0	30	76	0	47	151
Robert C. Hill	Ambassador to El Salvador	Sept. 25, 1954, to Sept. 21, 1955	30	39	5				30	44
Richard Lee Jones	Ambassador to Liberia	June 16, 1955, to present	0	0	0	62	17	0	62	17
William S. B. Lacy	Ambassador to Korea	May 8, 1955, to Oct. 20, 1956	0	0	0				0	0
Jesse D. Locker	Ambassador to Liberia	July 22, 1955, to Apr. 4, 1955 (de- ceased)	0	0	0				0	0
John A. Lodge	Ambassador to Spain	Mar. 18, 1955, to present	19	53	0	63	105	0	82	158
Clare Booth Luce	Ambassador to Italy	Mar. 2, 1952, to Dec. 27, 1956	87	69	0	84	23	95	171	187
Douglas Maxwell Moffat	Ambassador to Australia	Feb. 23, 1956, to Aug. 30, 1956 (de- ceased)				0	0	0	0	0
Dempster McIntosh	Ambassador to Uruguay	Sept. 26, 1953, to Apr. 3, 1956	58	20	0	0	50	0	58	70
Jefferson Patterson	Ambassador to Venezuela	Apr. 19, 1956, to present				24½	3	1	24½	4
Amos J. Peaslee	Ambassador to Uruguay	Apr. 25, 1956, to present				3	2	0	5	2
William T. Phelifer	Ambassador to Australia	June 15, 1953, to Feb. 16, 1956	51	55	0	3	0	0	54	55
Harold Shantz	Ambassador to Dominican Republic	June 2, 1953, to present	0	97	0	10	58	0	10	155
Joseph A. Simonson	Minister to Rumania	Sept. 27, 1952, to Aug. 30, 1955	5	62	5				5	67
Raymond Ames Spruance	Ambassador to Ethiopia	July 22, 1953, to present	0	0	48	30	81	0	30	129
	Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines	Jan. 18, 1952, to Mar. 31, 1955	4	0	0				4	0
Corrin L. Strong	Ambassador to Norway	June 24, 1953, to present	30	28	0	21	10	1	51	39
R. Douglas Stuart	Ambassador to Canada	May 28, 1953, to May 4, 1956	15	66	0	5	8	0	20	74
William Howard Taft III	Ambassador to Ireland	May 2, 1953, to present	7	40	0	15	34	0	22	74
John L. Tappin	Ambassador to Libya	Aug. 25, 1954, to present	14	7	0	47	39	0	61	46
Robert H. Thayer	Minister to Rumania	Nov. 4, 1955, to present	14	2	0	21	49	0	35	51
Thomas E. Whelan	Ambassador to Nicaragua	July 28, 1951, to present	10	38	0	32	22	0	42	60
Francis White	Ambassador to Mexico	Mar. 11, 1953, to present	36	51	0	59	16	0	95	67
Whiting Willauer	Ambassador to Honduras	Feb. 5, 1954, to present	9	75	0	45	76	0	54	151

¹ Figure included 15 days military leave.

Absences from posts of duty of career chiefs of mission during calendar years 1955 and 1956

Name	Title and country	Period of assignment	Absences (calendar days)						1955 and 1956 total absences, calendar days	
			1955			1956			Duty ness	Non- duty
			Duty	Vaca- tion	Sick- ness	Duty	Vaca- tion	Sick- tion		
Theodore C. Achilles	Ambassador to Peru	July 21, 1956 to Sept. 6, 1956				116	0	0	116	0
George V. Allen	Ambassador to Greece	Oct. 6, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
John M. Allison	Ambassador to Japan	Apr. 2, 1953, to present	30	8	0	0	60	0	30	68
Willard L. Beaulac	Ambassador to Chile	Aug. 22, 1953, to May 8, 1956	23	0	0	30	48	0	53	48
	Ambassador to Argentina	May 28, 1956, to present				7	0	0	7	0
Max Waldo Bishop	Ambassador to Thailand	Jan. 5, 1956, to present				42	5	0	42	5
Charles E. Bohlen	Ambassador to Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mar. 27, 1953, to present	139	8	0	12	70	0	151	78
James C. M. Bonbright	Ambassador to Portugal	Feb. 11, 1955, to present	12	19	1	7	40	0	19	60
Philip W. Bonsal	Ambassador to Colombia	Mar. 26, 1955, to present	14	19	0	67	23	0	81	42
Ellis O. Briggs	Ambassador to Korea	Aug. 25, 1952, to Mar. 23, 1955	30	0	0				30	0
	Ambassador to Peru	Mar. 24, 1955, to June 6, 1956	58	33	0	0	0	0	58	33
Henry A. Byroade	Ambassador to Brazil	June 20, 1956, to present				46	1	0	46	1
	Ambassador to Egypt	Feb. 27, 1955, to Sept. 10, 1956	8	0	0	35	0	0	43	0
John M. Cabot	Ambassador to Union of South Africa	Oct. 3, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
Cavendish W. Cannon	Ambassador to Sweden	Mar. 1, 1954, to present	18	39	0	124	77	0	142	116
	Ambassador to Greece	July 28, 1953, to July 27, 1956	14	20	0	0	0	0	14	20
Seiden Chapin	Ambassador to Morocco	Sept. 19, 1956, to present				44	16	0	44	16
	Ambassador to Panama	Oct. 1, 1953, to May 29, 1955	0	3	0				0	3
	Ambassador to Iran	July 10, 1955, to present	0	22	0	10	0	0	10	22
Hugh S. Cummings, Jr.	Ambassador to Indonesia	Sept. 3, 1953, to present	12	5	0	95	0	0	107	5
Walter S. B. Dowling	Ambassador to Korea	July 7, 1956, to present				12	4	0	12	4
Gerald A. Drew	Ambassador to Bolivia	Oct. 11, 1953, to present	0	5	0	10	43	0	10	48
James Clement Dunn	Ambassador to Spain	Feb. 27, 1953, to Jan. 23, 1955	0	13	0				0	13
	Ambassador to Brazil	Jan. 24, 1955, to July 4, 1956	13	20	0	0	24	0	13	44
Joseph Flack	Ambassador to Poland	Sept. 20, 1950, to Apr. 22, 1955 (deceased)	0	35	0				0	35
Waldemar J. Gailman	Ambassador to Iraq	Oct. 8, 1954, to present	2	0	0	17	42	0	19	42
Raymond A. Hare	Ambassador to Egypt	Sept. 17, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
Julian F. Harrington	Ambassador to Panama	Aug. 25, 1955, to present	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Donald R. Heath	Ambassador to Lebanon	Feb. 4, 1955, to present	100	12	0	59	4	3	159	19
John D. Hickerson	Ambassador to Finland	Oct. 4, 1955, to present	0	0	0	0	29	0	0	29
Joseph E. Jacobs	Ambassador to Poland	Apr. 1, 1955, to present	5	18	2	6	26	8	11	54
U. Alexis Johnson	Ambassador to Czechoslovakia	Nov. 10, 1953, to present	148	3	24	173	10	0	321	28
G. Lewis Jones	Ambassador to Tunisia	Sept. 28, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
Edward B. Lawson	Ambassador to Israel	Apr. 9, 1954, to present	8	36	0	34	0	0	42	26
Cecil B. Lyon	Ambassador to Chile	June 13, 1956, to present				105	0	0	105	0
Lester DeWitt Mallory	Ambassador to Jordan	Aug. 13, 1953, to present	101	21	0	22	70	0	123	91
Thomas C. Mann	Ambassador to El Salvador	Nov. 12, 1955, to present	0	0	0	0	51	11	0	62
Freeman H. Matthews	Ambassador to the Netherlands	Oct. 1, 1953, to present	0	139	0	5	25	0	5	164
Livingston T. Merchant	Ambassador to Canada	May 22, 1956, to present				12	0	0	12	0
Sheldon T. Mills	Ambassador to Ecuador	July 2, 1954, to Apr. 6, 1956	15	0	0	6	69	0	21	69
James S. Moore, Jr.	Ambassador to Afghanistan	Apr. 27, 1956, to present				11	9	0	11	9
John J. Mueolo	Ambassador to Syria	June 25, 1952, to present	4	10	3	45	23	2	49	38
Robert McClintock	Ambassador to Iceland	Aug. 23, 1954, to present	23	22	0	41	2	0	64	24
Jack K. McFall	Ambassador to Cambodia	June 29, 1950, to Oct. 15, 1956	27	5	6	32	34	0	59	45
Albert F. Nufer	Ambassador to Finland	Sept. 10, 1952, to Sept. 28, 1955	26	60	0				26	60
	Ambassador to Argentina	May 29, 1952, to May 12, 1956	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	18
	Ambassador to the Republic of the Philippines	May 10, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
J. Graham Parsons	Ambassador to Laos	July 27, 1956, to present				14	3	3	14	6
John E. Peurifoy	Ambassador to Thailand	Sept. 15, 1954, to Aug. 12, 1955 (deceased)	47	0	0				47	0
Lowell C. Pinkerton	Ambassador to Sudan	May 13, 1956, to present				77	0	0	77	0
Karl L. Rankin	Ambassador to Taipei	Aug. 8, 1950, to present	49	70	0	45	11	0	94	81
Christian M. Ravndal	Minister to Hungary	Oct. 3, 1951, to Aug. 3, 1956	141	2	0	9	7	0	150	9
James W. Riddleberger	Ambassador to Ecuador	Aug. 29, 1956, to present				2	66	0	2	66
G. Fredrick Reinhardt	Ambassador to Yugoslavia	July 31, 1953, to present	14	34	0	20	86	6	34	126
Joseph C. Satterthwaite	Ambassador to Vietnam	May 26, 1955, to present	3	16	0	14	33	4	17	53
Edward J. Sparks	Ambassador to Burma	May 3, 1955, to present	4	15	0	32	100	0	36	115
Carl W. Strom	Ambassador to Guatemala	July 21, 1955, to present	25	0	0				25	0
Llewellyn E. Thompson	Ambassador to Cambodia	Nov. 26, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
Harold H. Tittman	Ambassador to Austria	July 17, 1952, to present	83	27	3	13	18	0	96	48
George Wadsworth	Ambassador to Peru	June 18, 1948, to Mar. 30, 1955	0	7	0				0	7
Edward T. Wallis	Ambassador to Saudi Arabia	Oct. 21, 1953, to present	21	0	0	51	0	0	72	0
	Ambassador to Union of South Africa	Sept. 15, 1954, to Aug. 8, 1956	14	0	0	13	0	0	27	0
Angus Ward	Minister to Hungary	Nov. 2, 1956, to present				0	0	0	0	0
Avra M. Warren	Ambassador to Afghanistan	June 27, 1952, to Mar. 3, 1956	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Fletcher Warren	Ambassador to Turkey	July 28, 1953, to Feb. 15, 1956	20	10	0	0	0	0	20	10
	Ambassador to Venezuela	Oct. 3, 1951, to Mar. 24, 1956	35	6	0	0	0	0	35	6
Frances E. Willis	Ambassador to Turkey	June 6, 1956, to present				56	24	8	56	32
Robert F. Woodward	Ambassador to Switzerland	July 20, 1953, to present	114	11	0	0	16	0	114	27
Charles W. Yost	Ambassador to Costa Rica	Sept. 25, 1954, to present	8	1	0	10	53	5	18	59
	Ambassador to Laos	Aug. 18, 1954, to Apr. 27, 1956	14	16	0	8	7	0	22	23

Mr. President, these figures are shocking. They show that non-career chiefs of mission in 1955 and 1956 were away from their posts of duty twice as often as members of the career Foreign Service. This bad showing, I believe, is a reflection of the respective attitudes of career and non-career people toward their jobs. If an ambassador regards his appointment as a reward for some past service, why shouldn't he be away from his job? In his mind he has already done his job and he is merely enjoying the fruits of it. A man with that kind of an attitude is always willing to let his career assistants in the embassy do the work for him. It may be, Mr. President, that the publication of the figures on absences of ambassadors from their posts will serve as a deterrent to unreasonable conduct in the future. I want to say, Mr. President, that I shall do my best to see to it that similar figures are published regularly from now on.

While these figures are shocking, it must be recognized in truth and in fact that they are, at times, misleading as well. I refer, for example, to the outstanding services performed by such brilliant ambassadors as Clare Booth Luce in Rome and Douglas Dillon in Paris. It is a well-known fact that both of these individuals were incapacitated for relatively long periods of time due to illness. It is also a fact, to my personal knowledge, that much of their time away from their posts on a non-duty status was in connection with their duties as ambassadors and was in the performance of responsibilities which were carried out in the line of duty and in accord with their responsibilities.

We find, however, that during certain critical periods this nation has been without ambassadors to countries which were going through great difficulties. Last fall during the uprising in Hungary I called attention to the fact that there was no United States Ambassador on duty in Budapest at that time. In fact, some three months elapsed between the time that Ambassador Ravndal left his post and his successor, Ambassador Wailes, arrived. It is also my recollection that during disturbances in Poland last fall the United States was not then represented by an Ambassador in Warsaw.

Certainly during the past few months one of the major post-war crises in the Soviet Union has been in progress. Again, the United States had been caught without an Ambassador on the spot. Mr. Bohlen had left Moscow and the new Ambassador, Mr. Llewellyn Thompson, has only recently arrived at his post -- and then only because of the ousters of Malenkov, Molotov, and Shepilov. There were extenuating circumstances in this case due to Ambassador Thompson convalescing from an operation; there may have been in others.

Records which I have obtained from the Department of State indicate that we have been left without Ambassadors for substantial periods of time in the following critical spots: In Germany we were recently without an Ambassador for more than 6 months. In India we were without an Ambassador for more than 4 months in 1954 and 1955, and in 1956 and 1957 we were without an Ambassador for an interval of 10 months. In Iran in 1954 and 1955 we were without an Ambassador for 9 months. In Korea we were without an Ambassador for 9 months in 1955 and 1956. In Lebanon we were without an Ambassador for

some 5 months in 1954 and 1955. In Viet-Nam more than 6 months elapsed without our having an Ambassador in the years 1954 and 1955.

Mr. President, I could add to this list other examples of protracted periods of time when the United States has been unrepresented in important foreign countries because of delay in appointing Ambassadors to succeed those who have retired or been reassigned.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that career and non-career ambassadors should stay on the job as long as it is necessary so that the contact between the outgoing ambassador and his successor would be well established, so that there would be as little a break as possible in the continuity of the position, and so that we would be assured of adequate representation at all times in all countries to which we send our accredited representatives.

I should like to conclude these brief remarks by discussing another result, a favorable result, of the flurry over Mr. Gluck. The Committee on Foreign Relations has now decided that it will hold public hearings on every ambassadorial nomination unless for good reason the Committee decides otherwise. The rule of the Committee used to be that nominees were heard in executive session unless some member of the Committee asked that the nomination be heard in public session.

I can appreciate the doubts which some Senators may have about this change in the Committee rule. I realize that there is some risk that

questions will be asked and statements will be made which may embarrass us in our relations with some foreign country. I believe myself that it is possible to avoid instances of this kind to a large extent and I believe that foreign countries will be understanding about this democratic process, especially if they appreciate the fact that public hearings on ambassadors will help insure that we get better men. Mr. President, of course I have no intention of insisting upon hearing in public session those career officers whom the Senate has confirmed time and time again to be ambassadors and whom many of us know very well. I know that the new Committee rule will, even with these exceptions, cause an additional burden on the Committee on Foreign Relations. We must look forward to many additional hours each session in thoroughly examining in public ambassadorial nominees. In my judgment, however, Mr. President, this additional burden will prove to be well worth the trouble in the long run.

Mr. President, the United States has heavy responsibilities throughout the world. The importance of good foreign relations becomes greater year by year. The United States cannot afford to have less than the very best ambassadors. Let us hope that it will be to Mr. Gluck's unwitting credit that he made the whole country and the Congress appreciate this important requirement of our national policy.